

Serial No.: 10/718,137
Response to OA of 12/20/04

Remarks

In the present response, three claims (1, 4, and 5) are amended; one claim (7) is canceled; and seven claims (29-35) are newly added. Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 29-35 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claim 5 is amended to remove the word "silicon." Applicants respectfully ask the Office Action to withdrawal the rejection.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,093,623 (Forbes). Applicants respectfully traverse.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Forbes neither teaches nor suggests each element in the rejected claims, these claims are allowable over Forbes.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 7 indicated as being allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants submit claim 1 and all its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 4

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claim 4 would be allowed if written to include the limitations of the base claim. Claim 4 is amended to include all the limitations of base claim 1.

Serial No.: 10/718,137
Response to OA of 12/20/04

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forbes in view of USPN 6,180,496 (Farrens). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forbes in view of USPN 6,352,909 (Usenko). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claim 7 would be allowed if written to include the limitations of the base claim. Claim 1 is amended to include all the limitations of claim 7. The rejection of claims 6 and 7 is moot.

III. New Claims

Claims 29-35 are newly presented. These claims have numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in the art of record. By way of example, the art of record does not teach or suggest at least the following limitations of claim 29 (emphasis added):

cleaving, from the substrate, the first device layer and a first substrate section, **the first substrate section being below the first device layer and including a first portion of the substrate;**

cleaving, from the substrate, the second device layer and a second substrate section, **the second substrate section being below the second device layer and including a second portion of the substrate.**

Serial No.: 10/718,137
Response to OA of 12/20/04

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,



Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 281-514-8236

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number 703-872-9306 on this 16th day of March, 2005.

By

Name: Be Henry

